**Our Voices, Our Futures
End Term Evaluation Consultancy
Terms of Reference
Period: 1 February to 31 December 2025**

Introduction

About OVOF

Our Voices, Our Futures (OVOF) is a global South-led consortium comprising CREA, the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), UHAI - The East African Sexual Health and Rights Initiative (UHAI EASHRI) and WO=MEN Dutch Gender Platform with CREA as the lead of this consortium. Consortium members are complemented by strategic partner Iniciativa Mesoamericana de Mujeres Defensoras de Derechos Humanos (IM-D), a Mesoamerican women's human rights defenders (WHRDs) organisation. The four consortium members also work with their respective partners in the six countries of implementation: Bangladesh, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan and Uganda.

OVOF is a strategic partnership funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) under the Power of Voices stream. Power of Voices falls under the Strengthening Civil Society framework.

OVOF multi-country context

Due to rising global anti-gender, anti-rights movements led by state and non-state actors, political unrest, and COVID-19 pandemic, and climate shocks, civic spaces continue to be threatened and are narrowing, especially for marginalised and stigmatised populations. The communities most impacted include sex workers, lesbian, bisexual, queer and transgender (LBQT) women, and other structurally marginalised genders, such as trans diverse and gender non-binary persons.

Contextual examples, which are not exhaustive that have led to an increased sense of fear, sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), harassment and uncertainty that erode human rights include: *the strong anti-transgender movement is gaining ground in Bangladesh; marked increase in violence against minorities, especially Muslims in India; LGBTQ+ backlash and increased violence in Kenya fueled by local and international political, religious and far right institutions; conflict and anti-rights backlash by the state in Lebanon; conflict-based displacement of young feminists, women human rights defenders (WHRDs) and LBTQ persons in Sudan; and increased violence, insecurity and prosecution of LGBTQ persons following the passing of the Anti-Homosexuality Act 2023 in Uganda* (source: OVOF annual report, 2023).

Since OVOF's inception in 2021 these closing spaces have been observed in the six focus countries. The OVOF consortium amplifies the voices and increases the visibility of structurally silenced women and gender non-binary persons and communities. This means women and other persons who are structurally silenced because of their sexuality and/or gender identity - LBQ, gender non binary persons and trans women, or because of their work - sex workers and human rights defenders. The continued goal of OVOF is to enable them to take their rightful place in civic spaces and participate freely across the **online space, physical public space, and legal and policy space**. OVOF aims to strengthen feminist movements in the six focus countries as well as at global level, and expand their feminist political frameworks to be inclusive of intersectionality in their work and advocacy.

In its fourth year of the five-year program (2021-2025), OVOF members and their partners have been working in several ways to realise OVOF's vision. The strategies to demand and expand civic space for structurally silenced women are: *i) movement building to support collective agenda-setting and collaborative efforts, ii) creative use of arts, media, culture, iii) strategic use of technology to support open inclusive and safe online spaces, iv) direct advocacy, and v) supporting feminist movements and organisations to adopt Feminist Holistic Protection measures.*

The implementation of OVOF is conducted at two levels. Firstly, at the country level through the consortium member organisations and their partners through the strategies mentioned above, noting that UHAI is a movement funder and does not implement any activity directly, but provides grants to partners. The second level of implementation is at the consortium level through joint global Activities which are collective, strategic and contextually relevant activities agreed upon in consensus by the consortium member organisations.

Focus of the evaluation

The OVOF multi-country independent end evaluation (ETE) for the expenditure period between 2021-2025 will be conducted in Bangladesh, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan and Uganda, as well as at transnational level for global activities. For Sudan and Lebanon, specific arrangements will be made, including and majorly online arrangements, that meet the specific, contextual and adaptive needs and preferences of partners. The evaluation will also review any existing data and documentation of impact and learnings gathered during the implementation period, including the Mid-Term Review, annual reports and learning products. The evaluation and reporting are expected between February and December 2025. The evaluation will focus on two levels – the programmatic and partnership collaboration – to understand and document the progress, impact, and learnings from efforts and approaches to amplify voices and increase civic spaces under the OVOF program. This includes target communities (structurally silenced women), implementing partners, the feminist movement, and the wider ecosystem (i.e. political and decision-making spaces). The evaluation will follow the expenditure approach in line with the IOB criteria. The aim is to assess how far the actual expenditure compares to the planned expenditure to date, with clarification of any changes in expenditure, and the unexpected/unplanned factors (where experienced) that influenced the changes in planned expenditure.

The proposed evaluation design must detail the overall approach and evaluation methodology. This should justify how the methods and the triangulation of the findings are appropriate for the validity and reliability to answer the questions and respond to the objectives of the evaluation.

The programmatic level of the evaluation will focus on:
1. Relevance (in terms of whether the program interventions are aligned to the needs of the target structurally silenced communities)

2. Effectiveness (including achievements to date on the indicators that are linked to the Strengthening Civil Society and thematic Result Framework basket indicators, unintended/unexpected effects, and reaching the most marginalised rights holders)
3. Cross-cutting themes (i.e. gender, youth, climate, geography)
4. Efficiency: Theory of Change (including validation of assumptions)
5. Sustainability (in terms of continuity)

The partnership collaboration level of the evaluation will focus on:
1. Coherence (including coherence and influence, between the partnership the Ministry, and the Embassies)
2. Sustainability (in terms of Localisation/southern leadership and ownership)

The evaluation must include the OECD - DAC criteria effectiveness and coherence at the least (see Annex for OECD - DAC criteria)

Primary questions to be included for each criteria as a guide:
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

Sustainability: Will the benefits last?
Impact: What difference does the intervention make?
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?

Evaluation questions

Based on the evaluation questions below, the evaluation team will develop key guiding questions, which can be tailored to the specific countries, communities and other actors in the ecosystem.

Programme

Evaluation theme	Primary question	Sub question	Sub question

Relevance	To what extent and in what ways has the OVOF programme responded to the needs of diverse partners, their target communities and the broader ecosystem?	To what extent has the programme integrated intersectionalities and cross-cutting themes (i.e. gender, youth, queer womn, women with disabilities, climate, etc.)?	What still holds true with regards to the assumptions in the Theory of Change? (Validation of the assumptions)
Effectiveness	To what extent has the programme influenced the outcomes and results for different groups of people?	What unintended outcomes have been observed and documented?	
Efficiency	How efficiently has the programme responded to changes in external and internal shifts?	What adaptations to the theory of change and results framework were required?	What internal and external challenges influenced the adaptations i.e. COVID-19, political unrest, climate shocks, increased anti-gender sentiment, resources and staff capacity etc.?
Efficiency as Wholebeing	What are the contextual issues observed relating to the individual and collective emotional wellness of staff, partners and communities?	What gender-sensitive approaches have been employed to ensure emotional wellness?	

Sustainability	Which OVOF strategies are sustainable towards strengthening intersectional feminist movements? (Focus on both country level and global level)	Are OVOF strategies being replicated, by other community-led organisations, networks, donors, and integrated into government strategies? Which ones?	What more needs to be done to ensure sustainability?
Impact	What shifts have been observed by stakeholders (primary and others) in (freedom from) gender inequities, SGBV, SRHR, human rights, and agency of structurally silenced persons and communities	Have there been unintended/unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) at organisation, community, institutional (policy) levels?	
Coherence	Did different OVOF strategies interact in a cohesive way with each other, and with the strategic policy framework of the MFA and other strategies and frameworks of international/regional feminist movements and organisations?	Did the different strategies harness expertise of donors and progressive government policies?	At the global level, was there coherence with other movements and progressive human rights frameworks?

Partnership

Primary question	Sub question	Sub question	Sub question

Is the relationship between OVOF consortium members and partners one of equity?	What is the level of transparency on decision-making, budget etc. between members and partners?	What is the level of accountability in mutual reporting to each other? What is the level of accountability in mutual sharing of findings and knowledge sharing?	What approaches under OVOF capacity strengthening support given by each actor to each other have been meaningful?
Is the relationship between OVOF members and the MFA and other actors within the ecosystem one of equity, in coherence with the partnership approach of the policy framework of the MFA?	At the country level, has the relationship between OVOF members as well as partners and the MFA embassies been one of equity, trust and mutual learning?	Has the partnership led to meaningful collaboration, and has it supported the sustainability of the work of members and partners in the country?	At the global level, has the partnership between OVOF and the MFA supported mutual learning, and contributed to the sustainability of the work of OVOF?

Methodology design

Although the consultants will propose the appropriate methodology for the evaluation, this section provides guidelines on what type of method(s) is/are required/expected and/or set criteria for methodology, criteria for participant selection and sampling. The evaluation must also adhere to the IOB quality criteria of the MoFA, including its methodological requirements, and provide a clear approach to realise that. Links to OECD-DAC and IOB evaluation criteria can be accessed in the Annex.

It is recommended to explore and recommend women's empowerment frameworks[1] that help clarify the project's objectives – for example: *approaches that reach diverse silenced women; those that benefit women by improving their circumstances, health and lives (resources); and those that empower stigmatised women to actively engage in day to day activities, without fear of violence (participation); and make strategic decisions about their lives (agency); and those that transform gender relations, unequal power dynamics, harmful norms (institutional structures).*

It is also recommended to pay special attention to:

Funding and expenditure
The inclusion of a mapping of funding looking into:
- The budget and phases of phases of resources received by the partnership;
- Program resource allocation and rationale c. For example, but not limited to: capacity-building and well-being - internal; targeted activities/projects; advocacy; campaigns; crisis preparedness and adaptation; safety and safeguarding, etc.);
- Details/specifics on project-/programme components and activities.

Organisational capacity
The methodology to measure organisational capacity, which should be a robust methodology. A possibility is to use the five core capabilities (5CCs), for CSOs active at national and sub-national levels, as identified in the 2008 ECDPM study in capacity change and performance, or the eight core "advocacy capacities" as described by Elbers and Kamstra (2020).

At the inception stage, the methodology must be able to demonstrate the **plausibility of the claim** to evaluate the contribution, or attribution of the project's results to date at the outcome, or impact levels. At an impact level, unintended outcomes should be evaluated at a programme and partnership level. This includes the effects on the non-target populations and the broader effects of the interventions on society. The methodology to measure

---

[1] Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, A Conceptual Model of Women and Girls Empowerment; Bitar, Khalil, 2021, Social Equity Assessment Tool for Evaluation; Gender at Work, Analytical Framework - Gender at Work; Innovation Network, 2019, Evaluating Social Movement Power: Concepts and Indicators; International LGBTQ Youth and Student Organisation, Intersectionality Toolkit.

effectiveness should be a robust methodology validating causal chains/relations between activities and outcomes, i.e. how activities contributed to outcomes. The following qualitative evaluation approaches/methodologies are recommended:

- Realistic Evaluation
- Contribution Analysis
- Process Tracing
- General Elimination Theory

Efficacy and reliability of the secondary sources of data and evidence must be outlined, with regard to the types of sources (i.e. peer-reviewed and independent) that will be utilised at the desk research phase. It is important for the evaluators to identify the limitations in the reliability and validity of the proposed methodology, as well as other limitations to the evaluation scope. Moreover, potential bias, including selection bias that may influence the evaluation objectives and outcomes in the six focus countries and target communities who are recipients of the grant and program interventions should be identified.

Substantiation of findings and conclusions, ensuring that these are not based on anecdotal or one-off examples but anchored in obtained and presented results. With this, it is important to ensure that it is clear from what sources/upon the findings/conclusions/recommendations are based.

Sampling and case selection

The evaluation is expected to assess contextual gender and cross-cutting themes and the proposal should demonstrate an understanding of the different intersectionalities of the different communities and organisations, to ensure diverse and inclusive representation in the sampling. For example, gender and sexual orientation, age group (including youth), choice of employment, localisation, health status, conflict area and climate. The participation of the target audiences will be measured across **online spaces, physical public spaces, and legal and policy spaces.**

Case selection

The main goal of case selection is to gain a deep, contextual understanding of (a) particular case(s), which may provide valuable insights. Choosing specific cases for in-depth study will be informed by their relevance to the objective of the evaluation and evaluation questions

and their ability to guide the diverse perspectives, experiences and cross-cutting themes and intersectionalities of silenced women in different contexts.

Depending on the objectives, evaluation questions and analysis strategy, evaluators may select typical cases, extreme cases, critical cases, or comparative cases.

When sampling and selecting cases, the evaluators should:
- Formulate sample or case selection criteria (the set of characteristics that must be present) independently from the actively involved stakeholders;
- Be transparent about sample selection criteria applied, e.g. by presenting a list of all potential cases, interventions or countries and their scores or the selection criteria;

Feminist approach to MEL and research ethics

The MoFA acknowledges the importance of an inclusive approach to MEL and would like to ask partners to pay special attention to the key principles of a feminist approach to MEL in the ETEs. This approach is always human-centred and non-extractive – meaning that the target groups are at the core of the evaluation and promotes inclusive participation that is cognizant of power dynamics with groups and between the evaluators and the different communities, and other actors. To realise this, non-traditional, non-extractive, and participatory research approaches are encouraged. The evaluation team must aim to create a respectful, compassionate, and safe space, where all participants can express their views, experiences, and perspectives, without fear of judgement. As such, it is recommended that discussions are conducted in settings familiar to participants.

In alignment with feminist principles, the evaluation proposal must demonstrate an in-depth understanding of intersectionality, with a particular focus on gender and cross-cutting themes, the movement, and hierarchy and power dynamics in the focus countries and communities. Consideration must be given to the intended and unintended positive and negative results of the programme women and girls in all their diversity, LGBTIQ+ persons and other marginalised groups.

Solidarity and collective discourse for the evaluation

During the evaluation process, the team must build solidarity with the participants. If a process builds alliances through the varied involvement of different actors, or if the evidence is disseminated widely, then it can build solidarity across different levels to ensure collective action for change. The participants must actively inform and transform the

evidence-gathering and are well-represented throughout the research outputs and attribution. Their voices must be amplified through analysis, perspectives, quotes, and stories written in their voices.

Where possible, pilot training will be conducted to test the methodology and evaluation questions. This might involve, for example, test interviews and test focus groups followed by feedback from all those involved, on whether the questions were clear, the time allocated was sufficient, the setting was appropriate, and all ethical questions are dealt with appropriately.

Validating evaluation findings
Whenever possible, it is a critical part of feminist research and evaluation that findings are validated by the participants first, before wider dissemination. It is important to allow for research participants to reflect on and validate the findings and recommendations.

Safety and safeguarding

Expected provisions for safety and safeguarding

Safety must be the evaluators' first concern for all participants and the evaluation teams.
In line with the human rights principles of 'do no harm', the proposal must demonstrate in-depth knowledge of the dynamic socio-cultural, economic, political and environmental contexts in which the evaluation will be conducted, and how this may affect the participants' availability and potential aversion to participating.

Owing to political instability, conflict, forced migration, health outbreaks, and anti-gender sentiments, a contextual risk assessment and proposed mitigation plan for employing safety measures must be emphasised in the proposal. It is recommended that approaches to employing local mechanisms (i.e. community actors) for safeguarding support are included in the evaluation proposal. Safeguarding policies should be aligned to CREA, as the lead OVOF organisation, and should, simplified and made fully accessible to all participants. Safeguarding guidelines should be regularly revisited to ensure that these are constantly aligned according to dynamic experiences, contexts and rhythm.

Selection of safe spaces for conducting interviews and focus group discussions

Safety approaches must be detailed to ensure a contextual and localised understanding of potential risk, for instance, backlash and violence against participants. The successful

applicant for this evaluation will provide contextually relevant approaches for engaging with vulnerable communities in the focus countries and geographies (i.e. urban, rural, informal settlements and hard to reach areas).

Mitigating trauma and trauma management
There is always a risk of trauma and triggering conversations arising – particularly amongst highly vulnerable groups. Considerations for the evaluation approach must include recommendations for mitigating potential trauma and triggering of participants throughout the project.

It is recommended that a safeguarding/trauma management point person be identified by the implementing partner, and the participants be made aware of prior to commencing discussions (at the point of obtaining consent), who may be designated by the community members in some instances where community-led safety and security mechanisms are already in place.

Ethical research experience and training

Evaluators need to have prior training and experience in ethical research, data safety and safeguarding, and this should be outlined in the Expression of Interest. Evaluators should be familiar with the use of an ethical checklist for conducting research. This is to ensure that the evaluators are fully informed on global standards to engage with structurally silenced communities, particularly sensitisation on the contextual issues that are experienced by LBQ and trans women, sex workers, WHRDs and other structurally silenced groups.

Evaluators need to commit to identify concerns and issues and offer support and information to participants where safeguarding concerns are expressed. Equally, evaluators must be made aware of the risks of being involved in evaluation processes for some participants, as well as potential trauma experiences amongst themselves.

A comprehensive guidance document on data safety, data collection authorisation and informed consent, privacy arrangements, data and identity confidentiality will be provided by the OVOF team to the Evaluators at onboarding.

Deliverables and deliverable requirements

The language of the report is English. The maximum number of pages for each of the deliverables and structure of the final report will be agreed at the inception phase (for suggestions a non-mandatory format for ETEs will be provided as part of the onboarding of the consultancy). The OVOF ETE Reference Group is responsible and accountable for the approval of each deliverable at every stage.

Deliverables
- Inception report including: secondary research findings; evaluation methodology and approach; sampling criteria; fieldwork tools and guides; ethical training outline; risk and mitigation plan etc.
- Evaluation work plan indicating to key milestones (including points for review and feedback) and dependencies
- Status update reports at key stages in the evaluation
- Draft report(s)
- Final report (format to be agreed at inception phase)

Include a dissemination plan to share the evaluation findings with the OVOF local partners in the programme regions of focus, to be conducted by the consortium members.

Timeline

The evaluation timeline is 1st February - 31 December 2025. Key activities mapped to the proposed workplan should consider the following. e.g. logistics planning and mobilising and engaging with evaluation participants, in country data-collection and geographies, fieldwork findings transcribing, analysis, synthesis and documentation.

Key milestones:

December 2024: conduct interviews with evaluation consultancies.
31 January 2025: contract with evaluation team signed.
1 February 2025: ETE consultancy starts work - onboarding.
1 February to 31 March 2025: inception workshop and inception report.
1 April 2025 to 1 October 2025: implementation of evaluation research, data analysis and

synthesis.
1 October to 1 December: ETE consultants: analysis of final data harvested; validation workshops with partners and members; elaboration of first draft.
1 to 15 December 2025: review and elaboration of final report.
15 December: workshop presentation of final report with members and partners.

Roles and responsibilities

The Expression of interest should include clear demarcation of the evaluation team members across the six countries, their work experience and technical and local expertise/knowledge relevant for the success of the evaluation. The evaluation lead and team roles and responsibilities must be indicated. A reference should be made to the following points:
- Attention to gender expertise and gender balance within the evaluation team.
- Attention to relevant inclusion of national (in country) senior and junior consultants.
- Relevant expertise as per the topic of the partnership.
- Relevant expertise with similar evaluations, the application of rigorous evaluation methodologies and upholding the IOB evaluation quality criteria.

Reference Group

The OVOF ETE reference group made up of OVOF stakeholders (including the MFA focal point) and external reviewers will work closely with the ETE consultants. The Group is accountable for approving the following:
- Selected consultant(s) to be contracted as evaluator.
- Inception report by the evaluators.
- (Draft/Final) End evaluation report by the evaluator.

The objective/aim of the external reference group is to ensure/promote the quality of the evaluation process and the final evaluation report. The reference group will, based on its knowledge, expertise and experience, provide input and perspectives on:
- The robustness of the evaluation methodology (data-collection and analysis methods, sampling etc.)

- The extent to which the principles of 'do no harm' and 'inclusivity' are covered during the evaluation process as well as in the end report.
- Context sensitivity.

Budget for the evaluation

The End Term Evaluation budget is capped at **EUR 250,000** including tax. It will cover all fieldwork activities and consultant fees for the period **1 February to 31 December 2025.**

In the budget proposal, please take into account and include:
- Consultant fees for primary team members;
- The tasks/scope of the evaluation;
- The estimated size and scope of the programme to be evaluated - with the level of detail that is possible based on the information provided in the ToR and in the Annexes (in terms of e.g. five consortium members and one strategic partner, with 50 partners in six countries, as well as global activities). This will be finalised in detail at the evaluation inception phase;
- Expected number of working days.

Remuneration

Payment to the contractor is contingent on the approval of three major deliverables, as outlined below. These have to meet the IOB standards and the mandatory requirements outlined in the ToR. Remuneration per major deliverable will be divided as follows:
- 30% upon approval of the inception report;
- 40% upon submission of the draft report;
- 30% upon approval of the final report.

Selection criteria and process

- Realistic proposal in alignment with IOB and OECD-DAC criteria.
- Relevant experience in feminist evaluation at national and global levels and knowledge and independence of evaluators with regard to the programme(s)/ the partnerships/activities under evaluation.

- The majority of the team is based in an OVOF region and some of them self-identify as structurally excluded persons.
- Attention to gender expertise and gender balance within the evaluation team.
- Attention to relevant inclusion of national (in country) senior and junior consultants.
- Budget and timeline proposed.
- Relevant expertise as per the topic of the partnership.
- Relevant expertise with similar evaluations, the application of rigorous evaluation methodologies and upholding the IOB evaluation quality criteria.
- Good analytical evaluation report writing skills and ability to articulate stories of change.
- Expertise and alignment of the proposal to feminist approaches to evaluation.
- Demonstrated ability to approach evaluations from the lens of donor advocacy and/or recommendations to donors.

We invite interested applicants (individuals/teams/organisations/agencies) to send a short summary of appropriateness for the evaluation, expression of interest, together with the proposed budget and workplan, candidates' curriculum vitae and team profiles, by **8 December 7pm UTC** to elena.ghizzo@creaworld.org

For any questions or clarifications, please contact elena.ghizzo@creaworld.org.

The OVOF ETE Reference Group will hold the selection process and aims to conduct interviews with shortlisted candidates by 18 December 2024, with a decision made on the selected application on 20 December. Work is expected to commence on 1 February 2025.

Annexes [links to documents]

- [OVOF Theory of Change](#)
- [OVOF Results Framework](#)
- [OVOF Baseline Report](#)
- [OVOF Mid-Term Review Report](#)
- [IOB evaluation quality criteria](#)
- [OECD-DAC evaluation criteria](#)